

one of the three candidates I forwarded to President Bush.

On August 3, 2001, President Bush formally nominated Terrence O'Brien to the Tenth Circuit and the President's decision reaffirmed what I believed all along—that Judge O'Brien is an outstanding selection to fill Wyoming's seat on the court.

For 20 years, 1980–2000, Mr. O'Brien served with distinction as a State district court judge in Wyoming. During his tenure he earned tremendous respect from those who argued cases before him. I cannot imagine a finer individual who will join other notable Wyoming jurists on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, including; Wade Brorby, James E. Barrett, John Jay Hickey, and John C. Pickett, who by the way, was Wyoming's first judge to sit on the Court.

I also want to thank Senate Judiciary Committee Chairman LEAHY and fellow ranking Republican Senator HATCH for their work in reporting Mr. O'Brien's nomination. While our Federal judiciary current has 95 vacancies, today's confirmation of Terrence O'Brien is a step in the right direction. I look forward to the Senate's consideration of other article III U.S. Circuit and U.S. District Court judges.

If the mark that Terrence O'Brien left in Wyoming as a district court judge is any indication of his resolve and sharp judgment—our Nation can expect great things from a man who's appreciation and respect for the rule of law are without question. Without reservation, I know that Mr. O'Brien will serve with honor and distinction on the Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is laid upon the table, and the President shall be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate shall return to legislative session.

(Ms. STABENOW assumed the chair.)

Under the previous order, the Senator from Alaska is recognized.

THE ALASKA NATURAL GAS PIPELINE

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, before the distinguished visitor entered the Chamber, and before the vote and the statements were made by the Senators from Wyoming concerning their nominee, I was discussing problems in relation to the Alaska natural gas pipeline.

I think it is something on which the Senate ought to concentrate because we are clearly going to have to have a gas pipeline to bring to market the gas which was reinjected into the ground as Prudhoe Bay oil was produced. To bring that to market—50 to 70 trillion cubic feet of gas—we need a pipeline 3,000 miles long, gathering pipelines up to 1,500 miles long.

We are now in the position where there are only two steel mills in the world that are capable of delivering this steel pipe as it is designed.

Before the vote, I outlined the number of jobs that we have lost in the steel industry and the situation with the American steel industry. For this gas pipeline, we need 5.2 million tons of steel. We need \$3 to \$5 billion in steel orders. We cannot get that steel unless the U.S. steel industry gets back on its feet.

So for that reason, I started to think about how we could use some of the cashflow from the development of ANWR to start the process of the gas pipeline. As we examined that, we found the problem was not the steel industry as much as it was the rights of those who have been employed by the steel industry to have their medical care maintained. And that promise was a benefit that was agreed to many years ago for the contribution these workers had made to the military and civilian infrastructure of the country. It is, as I understand it, a potential lien against the steel industry as a whole.

We need to find some way to prevent these retirees from losing their health care coverage so that it will not be a lien against the assets of the steel industry as it tries to undergo consolidation now. The consolidation must be done if we are going to have the steel necessary to build the Alaska pipeline to bring our gas down to somewhere in the Midwest.

I was commencing to tell the Senate about two messages that I received today from a great friend whom I think is one of the most capable engineers in the oil and gas industry, particularly with regard to the pipelines and their design.

As I said, he told me there are only two steel mills in the world that are currently capable of delivering this pipe. He further told me that the pipe will require one-half of the world's capability to produce the pipe during the period of this order.

If the producers restart their work on this project this year, it would take until 2010 or 2011 for the gas to actually be delivered to our Midwest—9 years from now.

There is over 18 months of work required to complete the design so that it would be possible to order the pipe. For orders placed in 2003, the last pipe materials would be delivered to the field in 2007. That would enable the gas, if everything else goes well, to start being delivered in 2010, as I said.

Now, we have linked these issues together because of both the funding standpoint and the impact on national security and because of our absolute need for steel to build our gas pipeline.

Opening up the North Slope of Alaska to the drilling in what we call the 1002 area will bring a cash bid in 2003 and 2005. We propose to make some of that money available to initiate the process of rebuilding the industry and

taking the first steps to assure that the legacy fund of the steelworkers and the coal workers would be made whole.

Madam President, many people have argued with me about this. The House bill put money into the conservation account. An interesting thing about it is, if the amendment we have is defeated, the oil industry will not proceed, the steel industry will not proceed, the natural gas pipeline will not proceed, but not one of these radical environmentalists will lose their health care coverage. The American steel retirees are going to be the ones who pay the price in the long run.

I received a second message from my friend just before I came back to the Chamber, and that is that 30 percent of the pipeline materials will need to be delivered to the site by 2005, with the remainder to be delivered in 2007, as I said. I did not realize the steel chemistry for pipelines of this size has never been used. It will be what we call an X80-plus steel pipeline.

If the project proceeds in the first year, some of the pipe material needed to be manufactured will need to be tested for weldability and for fracture and burst analysis to assure the material chemistry in the pipe is correct. The timing and cost of all of this is critical to the pipeline project.

In addition to the pipeline pipe, there is a huge amount of normal steel materials required for compressor stations and the largest processing plant ever to be built.

The Alaska natural gas pipeline should be called the "Full Employment Project for 10 Years," maybe 15 years. It will require every person who is capable of working on such an endeavor in the United States and Canada for a period of over 8 years. It will not be built unless we realize the preliminaries must be completed before this pipeline can be built. It will bring down to what we call the South 48 the equivalent of a million barrels of oil a day, but it will be natural gas—high pressure gas pipeline, 52 inches in diameter, 1-inch thick.

I find it very interesting that as I talk about this subject, the commentators in the newspapers and whatnot say this is just a lot of baloney. These people are trying to link two subjects together. These are two subjects that have no individual answer. At the present time, we don't have 60 votes on the amendment to allow the drilling to commence in the 1002 area. We know that.

But the steelworkers and coal miners have no other cashflow either. They can't look for another source of money to meet their needs for at least 30 years. There are over 600,000 of them, and our proposal would start a cashflow from this new oil brought into our market. And it is money that is payable for the bidding process and from royalties on this oil that would help the steelworkers, the coal workers, and the industry to reconstruct itself.

We have been criticized about this all too often. I see my good friend standing here in the Chamber who might take umbrage at this. But during the time I was chairman of the Appropriations Committee, we provided \$17 billion for American farmers for emergency purposes because of failures in various parts of the agricultural industry. That was in addition to hundreds of billions of dollars that were spent by the Department of Agriculture in the same period. What do you think that money was used for? It was used to pay for the bills on the John Deere tractors. It was used to pay for the farmers' health insurance. It was used to pay for the cost of the agricultural community to survive during bad times.

These are bad times for the steel industry. There is not one bit of steel in my State. We have half the coal of the United States, but we do not have any steel. We have raised a question of trying to find an answer to the steel problem because of our own interest in the steel industry in the future. If there is no steel industry in the United States, we will not have an Alaska natural gas pipeline for years and years.

I see no reason why we should be afraid to marry two subjects that, if the supporters of each would get together, we would succeed. The radical environmentalists of this country have overwhelmed the Congress.

In 1980, my State faced the problem of a proposal to withdraw 104 million acres of Alaska for Alaska national interest lands. That is what the name of the act was, the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act. In 1978, my former colleague, Senator Gravel, had blocked that bill in the final minutes of that session, that Congress that ended in 1978.

By the end of 1980, we were at the place where there was a bill, but we said we would not support it, could not support it, unless we had the right to explore in the 1002 area, which is known to contain the largest reservoir in the North American Continent. And in a compromise entered into in good faith between those of us who represented Alaska and Senators Jackson and Tsongas, we got a bill passed which authorized the future drilling in this area and provided an environmental impact statement that showed there would be no adverse impact on the area.

Twice the Congress has passed such an amendment and twice President Clinton vetoed it. Now President Bush, knowing the international situation as it is, has said he wants this area opened to oil and gas exploration. We are trying to carry that load of getting the approval requested by the President of the United States. It is in the House bill, but it is not in this bill.

I find it very hard to represent a State such as mine, a new State. I have been in the Senate for all but 9 years that Alaska has been a member of the Union. The one absolute agreement, absolute agreement that we worked on

for 7 years was the agreement to assure that this area would be explored for its oil and gas potential.

When I was in the Department of the Interior during the Eisenhower administration, I helped prepare the order to create the Arctic National Wildlife Range. At that time there was no question that range was created, and it was specifically stated that oil and gas exploration could continue in that area, subject to stipulations to protect the fish and wildlife.

When we got to this bill, the so-called ANILCA bill, the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, we had the proposal to withdraw all of this land, and the House of Representatives, in its bill, closed this area to oil and gas exploration. The only basic change that we made in that bill, as it came out of the Senate, the only basic change that was absolutely demanded by the State of Alaska and all of us who were elected to represent the State of Alaska—both the State legislature, the Governor, and the three of us in the congressional delegation—was that area had to be available for exploration.

Senator Jackson, chairman of the committee; Senator Tsongas, author of the substitute; agreed to amend that bill to allow for the exploration and development of the oil and gas potential, and those in the Chamber now who challenge that are leading the fight to break a commitment that was made to a sovereign State. It was made to us as a State that the area would be available for exploration if we did not oppose any further the proposal to withdraw 104 million acres of land for national purposes in our State.

People say, why are you exercised about that? Our whole rights as a State were put aside until that issue was settled. The Alaskan people were entitled to select lands for the public land as part of our statehood act; the Native people were entitled to select lands in settlement of their claims. Over 150 million acres of Alaska to be selected to benefit Alaskans in the future, it all was put aside until those 104 million acres were set aside. The only thing we asked out of the 104 million acres was the right to explore this area, 1.5 million acres on the Arctic coast. That agreement was made.

There are people here in the Senate who voted for it who now tell us they are not going to vote to allow that exploration to take place. It is enough to strain anybody's conscience, and my conscience is strained because of the fact that I agreed to that proposition. I agreed to it. I believed in the system. I believed that once Congress made a commitment in law, signed by the President of the United States, it would be binding even on future Senators. Apparently, it is not.

I warn all Senators, don't trust the Senate. Don't trust a commitment that is made by your colleagues. Don't trust an agreement that you make with the Federal Government. Unless we can get

this area opened, there is no way I will trust a future agreement that is made here in the Senate Chamber with regard to future activity. I will insist that anything that benefits my State must be done now, not dependent on future Congresses in order to carry it out.

This is an unfortunate situation as far as I am concerned. I have not said the last.

Let me put this back up so people will see it again.

Madam President, this is the introduction to section 1002, the Jackson-Tsongas amendment, December 2, 1980. It specifically set forth the agreement we had made:

The purpose of this section is to provide for a comprehensive and continuing inventory and assessment of the fish and wildlife resources of the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge; an analysis of the impacts of oil and gas exploration, development, and production, and to authorize exploratory activity within the coastal plain in a manner that avoids significant adverse effects on the fish and wildlife and other resources.

That is the situation. That is the Coastal Plain, 1.5 million acres, part of the original Arctic Wildlife Range. That has never been wilderness. The balance of the wildlife range is wilderness, but the additions of the wildlife range are not wilderness. This is a concept—I really don't know how to deal with it other than to say this was a basic negotiated compromise between the State of Alaska and the people of the United States. We were assured that the area would be open.

Now, that little red dot there on the chart represents the amount of land we have agreed we would be limited to as we go into production—2,000 acres of a million and a half acres is what we are asking to be able to explore. We know where to drill now. The seismic work was authorized by the 1980 act and has been done. We are ready to drill now.

There is oil production right outside of that ANWR area. This is the Prudhoe Bay area here and this is Kuparuk Field. This is essential to our national security. At the time of the Persian Gulf war, that Trans-Alaska pipeline, going from Prudhoe Bay to Valdez, carried 2.1 billion barrels of oil a day. Now it carries 950,000 a day. We make up the difference by importing the oil from Iraq. As we buy the oil from Iraq, Saddam Hussein sends \$25,000 to the families of every one of the suicide bombers. We are paying for the terrorism that comes from Iraq because we continue to import oil that we could produce ourselves. We know there is oil there. The problem is, not only do we know there is oil there, but also in this big field up here, as we produce the oil, there is associated gas.

There is 50 trillion to 70 trillion cubic feet of gas there that we want to bring down to the 48 contiguous States. This chart will show where it will go. There are two routes proposed. This green line is the route. It is traversing a corridor that will come down the Alaska

Highway and across into Canada and then to the Chicago area. That is 3,000 miles, and 1,500 miles of gathering pipelines in the area.

There is no question that this gas is absolutely needed for our future. What is the key to that future? I am back where I started. The key is steel. If we don't have steel, we cannot build a pipeline. If the steelworkers don't get that legacy fund fixed, there will not be a consolidation of steel that will make a difference for us. We need the steel industry to come back into its own and for them to be able to deliver their portion of this steel. It will take half of the world's production for a period of 7 to 10 years to build that gas pipeline. That is why we are suggesting that we marry up the needs of the steel industry and our needs, as the State that wants to pursue development of that oil in the 1002 area, the million and a half acres.

I think we should do things in the national interest. I am sad to say that it increasingly looks as if it is not going to happen. We are still going to persevere and try to continue to convince people what would be the right and just thing to do here. But, above all, I hope every Senator will examine their conscience and answer the question of whether or not, if a commitment was made to them concerning their State by the United States in a law enacted by the Congress, suggested by two colleagues in the Senate, what would their attitude be if when the time came to validate that agreement, the Senate refused to do so?

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, one of the pieces of legislation I thought would be on the floor of the Senate by this time is trade promotion authority. I know our majority leader has a lot of problems and issues with which he has to deal. I think he has intentions of bringing the bill up sometime, but I am trying to encourage the Senate majority leader to bring it up soon because we have so many issues before us. I want to speak about one of those issues in regard to trade and agriculture.

Trade promotion authority is so important for us to get down trade barriers that stand in the way of the successful and fair trade of our agricultural products with other countries. Without trade, there is not going to be any profitability in farming. The fact is, we produce 40 percent more on our farms than is consumed domestically. So a good trade policy is what is necessary if we are going to have full production and if we are going to have profitability in farming.

We had the pleasure of bringing up a bill that had the support by a vote of 18 to 3 of the Senate Finance Committee. That was about 4 months ago and we

still don't have any commitment from the leadership to bring this critical, bipartisan trade legislation to the floor by a date certain, so we can plan on that date and be ready for one of the most important issues to come before Congress this year and eventually vote on it.

We have had several offers: that this bill would come up sometime this spring; one time it was in March; another time, it was soon after the Easter recess; now it is maybe sometime before Memorial Day. There is a great deal of uncertainty. During this period of uncertainty, we lose opportunities for the United States to be a leader in global trade negotiation.

Remember, this is not something new for the United States. This is something that the United States has been doing since 1947 when the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade was first started. Whatever success we have had until 1994, when the President's authority ran out, has been accomplished under U.S. leadership. We ought to be proud of our leadership and we ought to be looking forward to reestablishing that leadership once again after a period of about 8 years during which the President hasn't had the authority. Then we can continue the good things that happen when trade barriers are reduced.

The good things that happen are the creation of jobs. I don't want people to take my word for that. I want to repeat one of the things President Clinton has constantly said, which I agree with, and that is during his tenure as President, with a rapidly expanding economy—I think in the neighborhood of about 20 million new jobs were created during that term of office—President Clinton would say that one-third of those jobs were created because of trade.

I am not talking about trade as some abstract political theory or economic theory. I am talking about the good that comes from trade—the good of creating jobs in America, the good that it does for our consumers because of the opportunities to get the best buy for consumer goods.

President Clinton's bragging about one-third of the jobs coming from international trade was a direct result of 50 years of America's leadership in the reduction of trade barriers. Two of those major agreements were completed in the first year of President Clinton's Presidency—the North American Free Trade Agreement, as well as the Uruguay Round of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, which established the World Trade Organization as a more permanent forum for the establishment of trade agreements in the future and settlement of trade disputes.

I am talking about having a better opportunity for America's economy, for creation of jobs. Again, this is not something from which just America benefits. We can look at the economies of Korea, Taiwan, and Japan. As we

know, after World War II, they were in a terrible state of affairs. They were Third World economies. Look at what those economies have done in the last 50 years through the principle of trading and through the regime that was established under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. They were able to expand their economies to the advanced economies they have today.

By having trade in the 77 countries in the world that are the most poor—Africa and other countries as well—we can help them expand their economies or, as President Kennedy said in his Presidency, trade not aid, meaning that trade was a better way of helping the developing nations to become strong economies rather than the United States just giving something that was not an encouragement for them to advance.

When I talk about trade promotion authority, I am not talking about some abstract delegation of authority to the President of the United States to negotiate certain agreements that Congress is going to control in the final analysis as we have to vote on that product that comes out of those agreements. We are talking about helping countries all over the world because we have an expanding world population, and we have to have an expanding world economic pie. If we do not, we are going to have less for more people. But with an expanding world economic pie, for sure, with an expanding world population, we are going to have more for more people, and we are not only going to be talking about a better life for those people, but we are going to talk about more social stability, more political stability and more peace around the world.

This is a very important issue that we ought to be dealing with in the Senate. Every day we delay in approving bipartisan trade promotion authority for the President is another day that the United States cannot advance the interest of our workers or, in the case of my remarks today, the interests of America's farmers, ranchers, and agricultural producers at the negotiating table as effectively as they should, as effectively as we did in the Uruguay Round starting in 1986 and ending in 1993, which resulted in a very favorable agreement or any time since 1947. It is a reality, not some theoretical point.

While month after month there has been a delay in this issue coming up, our agricultural negotiators are at the table right now in Geneva. They are fighting for better market access for our farmers, but without trade promotion authority, our agricultural negotiators have one hand tied behind their backs. There are timetables, there are goals, and there are deadlines in Geneva that have to be met if these negotiators are going to accomplish what we want them to accomplish for the good of American agriculture.

Without trade promotion authority, it will not be the United States that will shape the negotiating agenda of